

OPEN

Lincoln Douglas

Second
3/15/12
11/9/12

Round 6

2

Room: Loyola 134
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Camacho, Erik

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View Bystrom

Max = 30

Evergreen Shen

Max = 30

Kyle Bystrom

29.5

Russell Shen

29.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Evergreen
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff says we util in "high risk" scenarios. Neg established ubiquitous risk to DPP in general. I don't grant Aff access to "no DPP for both is Aff ground" because the only analysis given was that we can give them both no DPP, not that that was Aff ground.

Room: Loyola 136
 Flight B: Start 5:00pm
 Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Schletzbaum, Cha
 Jeetendra Jungle

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

Olive Children Jen
 Jesse Jen

POINTS

Max = 30

25.4

NEGATIVE

Lynbrook Dong

Patrick Dong

POINTS

Max = 30

25.9

The better debating was done by the NEG from Patrick Dong - Lynbrook
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF	CG	NEG	NEG REB
<p>6:09:50</p> <p>① Moral obligation</p> <p>② All humans are equal.</p> <p>③ Individuality of healthy society</p> <p>④ Protecting human rights</p> <p>⑤ Unethical part of democracy</p> <p>⑥ Due process - Torture should be prohibited</p> <p>⑦ Inhumane</p> <p>⑧ National Citizens</p>	<p>6:16:00</p> <p>① Impact. C153</p> <p>② Intl law</p> <p>6:19:20</p> <p>NEG 6:21</p> <p>① Help w/ war on terror</p> <p>② Interrogation QB. Key to Terror Strike - Counter terrorism.</p> <p>③ Military operations for counter intel.</p> <p>④ Proliferation of nuclear weapons.</p> <p>- Due process will scare trials by jury may be biased..</p> <p>- Follow ICC no due process accord to Geneva Conv. POW</p>	<p>Underwrite state pawn by provider due process tank</p> <p>EF. 5:27:45</p> <p>① Link bet WMP & due process</p> <p>②</p> <p>1:30</p> <p>AFF REB 6:32</p> <p>① Creation of soft power</p> <p>② Does not starve how this allow N.B. - chain of evidence</p> <p>③ Not protecting human rights</p> <p>④ CIPR</p> <p>6:38:35</p>	<p>① possibly provide human extinction</p> <p>② - poison recre terrorism.</p> <p>③ outdated in presented at ICC</p> <p>④ Difference in magnitude</p> <p>AFF REB 6:45:25</p> <p>① Link chain weak.</p> <p>② Illogical argument about soft power</p> <p>③</p>

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Robertson

Max = 30

Westmont Young

Max = 30

Will Robertson

24.0

Bruce Young

28.0

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bruce Young
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

5:55

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF	NEG 5:36:20	NEG Rebuttal
<p>4, 5, 6, 8 annulment - NS, C.</p> <p>DoJ has carried espionage successfully</p> <p>representative forefeild</p>	<p>① Faulty verdicts - Jury has to be unanimous</p> <p>Negative won as affirmative</p> <p>② Juries can be perjured to continue due to ethnic bias</p> <p>③ Juries can be targeted by terrorist group</p> <p>- Physical integrity</p> <p>- Bring in terrorism home</p>	<p>① No arguments for C1, C2</p> <p>② Nothing used from preamble</p> <p>③ 300 yrs of military tribunal, Supreme Ct. hasn't done anything</p> <p>④ No HC</p> <p>⑤ Net benefits - 1 DoJ. No specifics</p>
<p>CE</p> <p>① morality</p> <p>② Const. specific</p> <p>③ Tag C1 -</p> <p>④ Proof Open Prison provide intel</p> <p>5:35-48 : 130</p>	<p>CE - What's good / morality</p> <p>C1 -> military Trib were set up by Congress</p> <p>mil. -> sub neutral judge</p> <p>NDA act.</p> <p>Rights - 9, 1</p> <p>CE 5:49:55</p> <p>- Advocate torture</p> <p>- What is NDA. (103)</p> <p>AFF Rebut 5:47:00</p> <p>5:49:10 1:30</p> <p>① Heabim Car spierced NDA</p> <p>② Like get rid of torture</p> <p>③ If we continue torture, hate & increase</p> <p>④ - Jury attack no evidence</p>	<p>⑥ No impact reducing torture</p> <p>⑦ we don't have torture anymore</p> <p>⑧ C1 -</p> <p>⑨ C2 - 8</p> <p>⑩</p>

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Fee
Shannon Fee

Max = 30
27

Bishop O Dowd Baldwin
Tealanie Baldwin

Max = 30
29

The better debating was done by the Neg from Tealanie Baldwin Bishop
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Uien Boyle Banita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

need to extend due process to accused
distraction, between right/wrong
upholding Human Rights.
All humans have same status.
[will ↑ soft power. this ↓ terrorish
Intl support is crucial = Allied support.
Q 7 military 500 public court cases
morality.
Intl law requirements.
hpi. Fed Ct's better than military tri.
arbitrary
the process = govt legitimacy
unchecked power.

Q How is Govt moral agent. Govt has its own personal goals
= tend to do moral actions
Q soft power Intern'l
= Contract. Citizens do not enter into
Govt = own people, protected
military tribunals. * protection of judges
sensitive information
enemy combatant do not have equal rights
Gt leak of information
Guantanamo. we have improved our image
criticize
GTD -
4 basic protections. * US does not give
all right when it is terrorist act.
2009 We give certain criteria with respect
to detention
We can't give them sensitive info
protect the majority before minority

RFD. that anyone citizen or non accused of terrorism
becomes a enemy combatant is what won her the round
But not this alone Her poise thought and outline of
fact figures that support her case too won her the rd.
Both engaged in great clash. Best of the day.

Room: Parlor B
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Hinojoza
Hinojoza, Justin

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bonita Vista Dawson

Max = 38

Imani Dawson

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop Dowd Clark

Max = 38

Graham Clark

~~26~~ 26

"pissed"

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bonita Vista Dawson
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AC is really dense and would benefit from a cleaner structure
- "signposting": you jump around too much
 - ↳ your coverage is good but you need to approach the IAR w/ a more coherent strategy
- Work on weighing arguments. Neg says terror ↑ b/c terrorists stop being afraid of torture & you say terrorism ↓ b/c terrorists have less incentive to commit acts of terror
 - ↳ which has the greater influence? is there a net ↑ or ↓ in terror

- NC is really wordy & repetitive, especially since you're only making one argument
 - ↳ courts leak secrets
- avoid saying things like "terrorists are pissed at us."
 - ↳ it really undermines your credibility

Neg impacts (courts release info) just avoid very strong and aff is doing some work to mitigate them

Neg didn't sufficiently answer Aff's two big args
1) terror requirement due to H.R. abuses
2) lots of innocents getting tortured and abused

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Harker Lee	Max = 30	Palo Alto Zheng	Max = 30
Matthew Lee	<u>28</u>	Austin Zheng	<u>29.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff. from Harker
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: Yes

Signed: Preety Mathur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.
You provided excellent evidence to support all your contentions, and thereafter, even in your rebuttals, you had good blocks to the neg. contention 2, where you said courts can't be compelled to reveal sensitive information.

Your defense of your value was good & convincing. Your defense of your criterion & evidence won you the round.

Neg.
The neg. was able to defend how checking the excessive powers of military tribunals & govt. needs to be done. Your point on the fact that it's the congress who declares war was noteworthy, but that did not help you in defending your value.

He rightly said that you had no evidence to show for loss of lives due to D.P. directly.

Your debating skills are definitely superior & I was tempted to give this round to you.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Saratoga Krishna	Max = 30	James Logan Q-Tran	Max = 30
Rohith Krishna	<u>28</u>	Louis Q-Tran	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the APF from Saratoga
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: T. Bunting

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative has been kind enough to allow Negative to focus on alternate value criterion. But, Negative was not able to use this to the maximum advantage and told that US combs are all biased without giving any examples. Affirmative successfully argued that US combs are fair to try all people.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Mittal	Max = 30	Palo Alto Parker	Max = 30
Mudit Mittal	<u>28.4</u>	Coby Parker	<u>28.2</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from MSJ Mittal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Virginia Wu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted ~~neg~~ affirmative because he showed strong rebuttal and ~~made~~ made good points on argument. The negative agreed that affirmative should win if he could prove his point which ~~made~~ ^{gave the} affirmative ~~team an~~ ^{team an} upper hand on the rebuttal.

Both teams did a good job on research but affirmative was able to put doubt on negative's argument.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Polytechnic Zhou

Max = 30

Jimmy Zhou

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Bisen

Max = 30

Yash Bisen

27.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from JIMMY ZHOU
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative case made a plausible argument that the court system could not support the resolution and hence things could be much worse. The neg case did have more evidence on this point (the citation) so I had to think it was a plausible problem. However it also seemed plausible that the problem could be overcome, which was affirmative's argument to the point. Then the affirmative case seemed more plausible as negative did not spend a lot of time on affirmative's contentions. Negative had a novel case but affirmative won. It was an honor to see your judge.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Ritchie

Max = 30

Mountain View Thvar

Max = 30

Nathan Ritchie

28


Keshav Thvar

23

The better debating was done by the AFF from Nathan Ritchie
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF provided quote by Constitution author supporting the point of non-citizens being covered by the constitution.

The NEG had many points in his original speech that were not brought back in detail as rebuttal. Rather the debater spent time "advertising" that he should win the debate.

Room: O Connor 110
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Lim, Wee-Lee

Naik, Mehal

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

EVHS

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland Hu, R

Max = 30

MSJ Tummala

Max = 30

Rebecca Hu

29

Vineet Tummala

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: MEHUL NAIK EVHS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent debate by both contestants. Great use of references to justify position. Appropriate responses to opponents cases most of the times.

Ultimately AFF won on the argument that Military tribunals are not a better way to enhance national security (leg's main value) by citing the # of cases decided in Fed Court, no leaks.

They justified not having due process (ie military tribunals, Guantanamo bay and due process voiding creating a new order of terrorists, but AFF's stats were very damning. AFF argument of guilty ~~was~~ ^{verdict}

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Narayannan

Max = 30

Ajjit Narayannan

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga Kannan

Max = 30

Deepti Kannan

27.0

The better debating was done by the Aff from James Logan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *BLK*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ajjit *good delivery, eye contact in speech during cross exam good strategy to take control very cross examination, showed confidence used neg's card to question foundation, good strategy at least as it came out during the debate*

Deepti *gave away control in cross examination cross exam answers not given confidently 6 min rebuttal generally good, but why introduce new evidence - as to concede defeat-?? always push on and fight to the last!*

Room: O Connor 103
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Bhateja, Rajiv~~

JOHN BORECZKA JAMES COGAN

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas Garg

Max = 30

Rakshit Garg

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bonita Vista Rosal

Max = 30

Joebert Rosal

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from GARG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: John Boreczka JOHN BORECZKA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AFF CASE OF MORAL JUSTICE TO MINIMIZE TERRORISM WAS WELL LAID OUT. NEG ARGUMENT ABOUT PUBLIC SAFETY WAS WELL REBUTTED AND NEG ARGUMENT DIDN'T WITHSTAND CROSS AND REBUT.

AFF: GOOD PRESENTATION - VOICE + BODY LANGUAGE. DID WELL IN CROSS EXAM ON BOTH SIDES. HAD A VERY STRONG REBUTTAL THAT FRAMED BOTH SIDES AND PREVAILED.

NEG: GOOD VOICE + BODY LANGUAGE WHEN SPEAKING. DIDN'T DO VERY WELL DURING CROSS EXAM PART TWO, BUT DID USE FIRST PART TO FRAME ~~THE~~ AFF ARG. STRONG REBUTTAL HELPED COVER SLIPS IN CROSS, BUT DIDN'T PUSH FORWARD ARGUMENT.

Room: O Connor 103
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Bhateja, Rajiv~~

JOHN BORECZKY JAMES LOGAN

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Chawla

Max = 30

Westmont Fishbin

Max = 30

Shweta Chawla

29.5

Rachelle Fishbin

29

The better debating was done by the AFF from CHAWLA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: John Boreczky JOHN BORECZKY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AFF ARGUMENT OF ABIDING BY OUR CONTRACT WAS STRONG, NEG ARGUMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND STATUS QUO WAS ALSO STRONG, THE FLOW WAS WONDERFUL, WITH NO DROPS. IN THE END, AFF WAS ABLE TO COUNTER ALL OF THE NEG POINTS, BUT IT WAS VERY CLOSE.

AFF! STRONG SPEAKER WITH GOOD EMPHASIS ON KEY POINTS, SPEAKS FAST, BUT IS ALWAYS CLEAR, FOUR MAIN POINTS BLURRED TOGETHER A BIT, AND CROSS POINTED THAT OUT. GREAT JOB OVERALL

NEG! STRONG SPEAKER TOOK A DIFFICULT ARGUMENT AND ALMOST SOLD IT. I FELT A WANT OF EVIDENCE FOR SOME ASSERTIONS, GREAT JOB OVERALL.

Room: O Connor 102
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Tran, Fei Long~~
shah, Monali
Harker

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Lau	Max = 30	MSJ Zhang	Max = 30
Andrew Lau	<u>28</u>	George Zhang	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Palo Alto Lau
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RF

Very close debate.
 In the end, this debate was won on rebuttals.
 AFF won the round because it was able to uphold
 the governmental obligation VC better & had bigger
 impact.

Good Debate

Room: O Connor 204
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Schletzbaum, Jam

Wee-Lee Lim (Harbor)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bishop O Dowd Hawkins	Max = 30	MSJ Sreekumar	Max = 30
Anna Hawkins	<u>26</u>	Sanjay Sreekumar	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Sanjay Sreekumar
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *A-Wee-Lee*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative should make her speech more concise so that she can deliver it in a less hurried manner.

I voted for negative because he made a stronger case in the context of the resolution whereas the affirmative seemed to be advocating a position that is not completely in line with the resolution with regards to constitutional due process protections.

Room: O Connor 204
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Schletzbaum, Jam
(Vee-Lee Lim (Harber))

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Huang

Max = 30

Evergreen Tallapragada

Max = 30

Ryan Huang

27

Amit Tallapragada

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Ryan Huang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *A. Weehee*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good job to both sides - your presentations were clear & delivery was great!

On balance, affirmative made a stronger case based on the context & agent of the resolution. The negative needed to challenge the affirmative's contention that national security procedures should not differ based on nationality.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
St Francis Ratnam	Max = 30	Palo Alto Warner	Max = 30
Sheryl Ratnam	<u>27</u>	Alex Warner	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Palo Alto
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: You made several excellent responses to the Neg in the IAR, but did not make many specific extensions from your affirmative case. This is largely a result of poor time allocation; while the case you read against the NC was excellent, it took up a ton of speech time and cut into your ability to ~~read~~ give us a clear picture of what's going on in the debate. This ended up costing you the round, too, which is a bummer b/c you were way ahead.

Rest of critique given orally (same decision) per request; I voted neg b/c aff made no contention-level extensions in the IAR and thus has no impacts.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Ajit Kirpekar

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Fong

Max = 30

Palo Alto McNamara

Max = 30

Nathan Fong

27.2

Addie McNamara

28.4

The better debating was done by the NEG from Addie McNamara
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Ajit Kirpekar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff pts
Moral values, Constitution is important, torture is bad, due process is better because it promotes safety. Trials protect the innocent. Torture produces false info.

Neg cons
no good pt = due process ^{does not imply} ~~does not~~ imply torture will be used.

- Negative points
- States do not need to apply to individual morals.
 - National security should be maximized.
 - due process reduces counter terrorism
 - discloses tactics (hurts national security)
 - states obligation is to its citizens over human rights

Aff cons

- only negative is classified info - her negation relies on the assumption that the stated resolution is worse than the status quo.

Reasons - Neg spoke her pts more clearly and better refuted Aff.'s pts.

Room: Sobrato C-C
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Talla, Theja~~
Jamie Chan party

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Mountain View Hulett	Max = 30	MSJ Rajvanshy	Max = 30
James Hulett	<u>29</u>	Raghav Rajvanshy	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the ^{AFF}James from James Hulett
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF speak more clearly :

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Hari

Max = 30

Evergreen Naik

Max = 30

Anant Hari

27

Akshay Naik

28

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from Evergreen
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative: - Presented a very strong case. The morality factor was dismissed by the opponent with a solid logic. ~~the~~ The Affirmative team was not able to refute the neg examples.

Neg: - Presented the case with security concerns. His case was good until he distinguished the citizen & non citizen ~~the~~ definition. But his comment that the US is not member of International Court System proved the US's right to defend its citizens from non citizen terrorists. The top responsibility of the govt. is to protect its citizens. Neg was able to prove it well.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland Kim

Max = 30

James Logan Meller

Max = 30

Yi Youn Kim

27.5


Mikhail Meller

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Mikhail Meller
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I vote NEG for this debate

- The neg held his position very well. The way he took a position on the issue was very strong. He backed it up w/ good facts and statistics as well. The rights that he proposed were very strong and the Aff could not rebut, so his argument stands.

- The Aff did a good job present evidence, but when cross-examined she did not answer very well to the Neg questions. make sure to back up all your claims during the cross-exam. The Neg was able to pick up on this and call you out on it.

Room: O Connor 207
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

MSJ-LD-06, MSJ-L

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Rahimi

Max = 30

Saratoga Hsiao

Max = 30

Rod Rahimi

29


Derek Hsiao

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from DEREK HSIAO
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: YES

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The winner had better argument on value, criterion & contentions

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Takeuchi	Max = 30	MSJ Nayak	Max = 30
Rick Takeuchi	<u>26.5</u>	Akaash Nayak	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from MSJ
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ultimately, the neg illustrated clearly that his C2 (torture okay arg) leads to further safety of the ppl. The aff seems to focus the brunt of his arg on torture bad ~~is~~ and has many and then and then (never ending links). Neg linked to both vc and illustrated clear rzn's why tribunals are superior.

- face judge during cross ex
- using general blocks to refute isn't always the best strategy
- good passion in speeches

- good job impacting/explaining how cards used in rebuttal interact w/ opp case
- lots of responses in 1st speech but very messy presentation → please label rebuttals 1, 2, and confusion about cards reading took away from rebuttal
- you extend your C2 but it's not a full extension → please extend C, w, i you clearly won vc debate so no rzn not to be linking
- good, thorough round analysis w/ voters
- you don't take full adv of your burdens at all... not clearly extended

Room: Benson 15
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Chen, Mr.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Lai

Max = 30

Lynbrook Wang

Max = 30

Ryan Lai

27

Christine Wang

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Lynbrook
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides speak well. Neg side did a better job and convinced me.

Room: Loyola 134
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Camacho, Erik

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

St Francis Chen

Alex Chen

POINTS

Max = 30

28.5

NEGATIVE

Leland Hu, E

Ethan Hu

POINTS

Max = 30

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from St. Francis
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ALT dropped, & clear neg offense from risk of leak,
clear AC info-gathering + soft power extensions

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE
 Palo Alto Haris
 Anish Haris

POINTS
 Max = 30
28

NEGATIVE
 James Logan Marsh
 Kendra Marsh

POINTS
 Max = 30
29

The better debating was done by the AFF from Anish Haris Palo Alto
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: X

Signed: [Signature] Bonita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

International accused.
 ought = moral obligation
 minimize
 • torture Guantanamo
 • should not be permanent policy
 • leads to ↑ terrorism
 • ↓ torture ↓ terrorism
 • soft power. econ limit.
 • allied nations like detainees
 • We need other nations to help us in fight against terrorism
 • targeted killing = backlash resulted in 9/11 = 3000 deaths
 • kills innocent people. Makes US the terrorists
 • we will use all of our resources instead of the fight over terrorism would be a multinational effort. 2011. severe backlash from targeted
 • US bully. work with other nations - share our resources

agreed to from both states
 • left room - when have they refused
 • whoever minimizes terror = less deaths
 • charged U fault
 • reason to extend to noncitizens.
 4th & 5th Amendments. could limit our ability to use other methods
 • due process = terrorism grows in prisons
 leads to bigger problems
 • same value of criterion
 • targeted killing reduces terror threats
 • AFF & evidence of Nations & working with it
 • Reduce terrorist threats
 ↓ by 30% ↓ # by 5% in every single incident of targeted killing
 Radicalization - ongoing problem
 advocating for torture
 other nations will continue to work despite torture & we are a powerful nation.

I found in favor of the AFF case due to the following reasons -
 AFF's position on targeted killing, the link to 9/11 and how the terrorist view the US. That the agreed upon measure of the round was the # of terrorist deaths due to which was agreed by both parties and AFF clearly won this part of round. And additionally the 2011 evidence of the backlash from targeted killing.

Room: Parlor B
 Flight A: Start 4:15pm
 Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Hinojoza
 Hinojosa, Justin

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

Westmont Keates
 Paula Keates

POINTS

Max=30

28

NEGATIVE

Bonita Vista Mariscal
 Alexander Mariscal

POINTS

Max=30

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Westmont Keates
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

NEG

- Clear what/how your CI impacts the framework
- You need to do more to justify your criteria
 - ↳ most of your CI is really a justification of this link
- The only link you have between denying DPP & devalue is at the bottom of CI
 - ↳ "we've been seeking ="
- Your impacts to devalue need to be a lot more concrete.

- You need to be more emotive; I got bored during your speech (NC)
- You seem to really misunderstand Mill's point
 - ↳ his argument is that there are different kinds of pleasure
 - ↳ he then says that intellectual pleasure (art, music, philosophy) is more valuable than physical pleasure
 - ↳ this confusion becomes obvious by how you define "rational thought" as "thinking about something really hard."
- Gah the monotone!!! It's like a lullaby

Aff answers back Neg with arg (courts can't keep secrets) & outweighs w/ devalue impacts

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker Shah

Max = 30

MSJ Desai, A.

Max = 30

Manan Shah

27.5

Anuj Desai

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from MST
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Preety Mathur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.

Your arguments were convincing, esp. the 200 cases card, however you did not pursue the immigration card contention by the Neg, which was a strong evidence in his favor.

I agreed with you on the practicality argument though.
Your cross-ex was good.

Neg

I liked your thoroughness of rebuttals. Your cross-ex. & discussion on points to win was interesting, but you used your strongest card when you picked up on the aff's dropping your illegal/immigration argument.

You rightly pointed out that

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Sinnarkar

Max = 30

Palo Alto Ho

Max = 30

Violet Sinnarkar

27.5

Jeffrey Ho

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Palo Alto
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Tubman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative has shown impatience while opponent was cross examining and did not give the opponent a chance to complete ^{without} _{one} ^{the} occasion. Negative has shown strong examples on soft power with a card and used it effectively while Affirmative just gave a definition. Affirmative did not have good examples on reducing terrorism and the Negative won on being consistent on value (morality).

Affirmative can do better by giving value to opponent's arguments.

Room: Sobrato C-C
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Talla, Theja~~
Jamie Chan paly

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Diablo Valley Mishra	Max = 30	Milpitas Ngo	Max = 30
Archit Mishra	<u>27</u>	Jonathan Ngo	<u>30</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jonathan Ngo
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg had very close argument, to ~~the~~ AFF by attacking each of his points. AFF did not attacked Neg's ^{side} points at first, so, he lost there.

Neg speak more clearly and more convinced.

Room: O Connor 106
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Huang, Rong

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Moraes-Liu	Max = 30	MSJ Prasad	Max = 30
Juliana Moraes-Liu	<u>28.3</u>	Abhinav Prasad	<u>28.50</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from MSJ Prasad
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Virginia Wu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted negative because he ^{was able to provide} ~~showed~~ a better understanding of the constitution on due process and cite the 14th Amendment to support his argument. ~~Affirmative~~

Both teams did a good job on research and had good points on the argument. However, negative has a strong cross-examination and rebuttal.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Natarajan

Max = 30

Arvinhd Natarajan

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker Rao

Max = 30

Sagar Rao

27.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Arvinhd Natarajan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Outstanding debate. I found it plausible that there is a link between torture and detention centers. Negative had many compelling data points but in the end couldn't quite stand up to the strength of the Aff case. I thought the preparation on the moral aspect outweighing the national security aspect was ~~an~~ an example of excellent preparation.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Lee

Max = 30

La Reina Draper

Max = 30

Jia Hui Lee

22


Kate Draper

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Kate Draper
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF contention of morality was refuted well as a subjective basis.

Additionally the NEG provided Supreme court decision information as the basis for continuing status quo

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Oakwood Mathur

Max = 30

MSJ Wadhera

Max = 30

Shivani Mathur

28

Karuna Wadhera

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from MSJ Wadhera
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF:

1. Speed is alright, but relax increase your syntax variance. Pause; ↑ your tone to create emphasis. I'm not sure of your point. I understood all the words, but didn't ramify it well due to flat tone.
- X: Relax, you get pity-points if you are nice when she's aggressive. Watch your informal language "sue" "ad stuff"
- X: Interesting line of attack against her point. Torture may not be the best attack. You've given her because "okay sue sue" → no. This was more effective than your speech.
2. Prime attack structurally. On a specific vote on torture, strong but I allow her to be specific and torture didn't help. ~~Helping your style to~~ Empty huds are strong. Good work getting essential when you did.
- F: Torture arg. No, you're wrong. Strong to say but incorrect. Pick Your Battles → Torture Reduction

NEG

- X: Good point about washiness of values. But too aggressive & fear. Let her finish, or at least be nicer about it.
1. Sept "6 years"? Your opening discussion was just fast enough to not ramify. You're loud, which is nice, but vary your tone and pace to create impact. Good insight to simplify her convoluted case. You don't need all her points, only ones that count. Relax. Slow down to cover less, more effectively.
- X: Relax. Your attack - tone and narrow. Doesn't endear you.
2. Much Better spacing and tone. pron: "negligible". Your defensiveness is not helping. "She said I... but I..." didn't help you. Focus on your arguments rather than formality.

Tough choice because of a lack of impact and too high granularity of argument. Both: Gauge your judges. Watch what they write. If they're not tracking your case, don't use case terms "intention 2" etc. Talk about the points.

Room: O Connor 110
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

Lim, Wee-Lee
Naik, Mehul

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL EVHS

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

James Logan Wong

John Wong

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

Leland Liu

Stacy Liu

POINTS

Max = 30

29.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from James Logan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: My

Signed: MEHUL B NAIK, EVHS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very well contested debate. Both contestants did an excellent job with well thought out and coherent responses.

Ultimately AFF won as neg failed to properly respond to arguments on due process being more than just trial trials - that's due process, - failed to cover the rest of areas.

Aff also made a good rebuttal on cost, leaks, suspects being equal whether due process is followed or not.

Neg also did not address properly the citizen-non citizen argument

Room: Loyola 137
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

2, Leland Judge

Paty Ben Quay

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Paramasivan

Max = 30

St Francis Singh

Max = 30

Santhosh Paramasivan 26.5

Akriti Singh 28.0

The better debating was done by the Neg from St. Francis
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Santhosh - Read from paper - no eye contact
gave away points in cross exam
first rebuttal not cohesive*

*Akriti - reasonably cross exam -
good eye contact & gesture in delivery
good cross exam sentences
good covering of basis in negative rebuttal*

Room: O Connor 102
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Tran, Fei Long~~

shah, Monali

Harker

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga Munukutla

Max = 30

Palo Alto Hashmi

Max = 30

Venkat Munukutla

28

Noah Hashmi

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Saratoga Munukutla
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

Good debate at both ends.
In the end, AFF won the debate for able to uphold VC of maximizing life & liberty. Negs VC of accurate determination of guilt was based only on Military Court being pvt. Neg needs to be able to support & prove live arguments to achieve morality and fairness. Should also go for more bigger impacts. Also be careful with your cards.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

2:10 P

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bonita Vista Gonzalez

Max = 30

MSJ Dhara

Max = 30

Sabrina Gonzalez

29

Raghu Dhara

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bonita Vista
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Great job defending your case in CX! Your IAR was also very good, and you did a great job making specific references to the places where you and your opponent clashed and comparing competing impacts. It's clear that you've done some reading on U.S. Foreign Policy, too, and so I was really disappointed by your AC, which lacks internal links and didn't have as much personality.

Neg: You did a really good job speaking clearly, and you made some ~~good~~ responses to the AC. However, while your responses were good, there weren't enough of them, and too few of them are your own analysis. This complicates your NR (even though it was fantastic-- loved the voting issues!) because lots of your analysis was new.

This was a close round, but I think the Aff is ahead in the value criterion debate, and thus outweighing the negative's key offense.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Ajit Kirpekar

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ Chopra
Aditya Chopra

POINTS

Max = 30

27.8

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Braun
Noa Braun

POINTS

Max = 30

27.6

The better debating was done by the AF from Aditya Chopra
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Aj Kirpekar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Affirmative
 - Terrorist suspects be given constitutional rights
 - morality
 - protect citizens (government obligation) - rights take over national security
 - Softpower
 - due process increases softpower
 - Uses of torture damages US int reputation
 - hypocrisy given US emphasis on human resources
 - statistics support softpower.
 - Better to human rights avoid future dangers
 - Neg
 - determining guilt = more important than due process
 - government trial gives better trial than Federal - allows for classified info - (simultaneous allow for protection of national security plus due process)
 - due process curtails Nat security.
- neg-biased jury, glamorize terrorism in public courts,

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

Palo Alto Zhang, K.

Kevin Zhang

POINTS

Max = 30

27

NEGATIVE

Diablo Valley Bhargava

Rohan Bhargava

POINTS

Max = 30

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Diablo Valley
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - Value morality. Started off with value criterion as maximizing national interest and said national interest is all but later changed to national security. Didn't provide definitions. Did very good on contentions. Didn't provide evidence for reputation about info leak is stopped from 2009. Good speaker

NEG: Clear speed. good crisp strategy. refuting 3rd contention could have been better.

Room: Benson 21
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Leal, Steven~~

Mishra, TC

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

Douglas Frost

Andy Frost

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

MSJ Calambur

Vivek Calambur

POINTS

Max = 30

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Douglas.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Mishra

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative: - Very strong case and argument regarding slavery to thwart affirmative case. The candidate was able to justify that morality was recognized and slavery was abolished from constitution. ~~Very~~ excellent argument.

Neg - Neg brought slavery law of past to justify his case, but Aff. team was able to thwart it. He was not able to push his case.

So Affirmative wins!!!

Room: O Connor 104
Flight A: Start 4:15pm
Open Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Peters, Bud~~

Schwartz, Emily

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Nouri

Max = 30

Lynbrook Walia

Max = 30

Koosha Nouri

28.5

Dhruv Walia

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Koosha Nouri
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I vote for the Aff

- The Aff had very good main points, and gave good evidence. The Neg was able to find flaws but the Aff did a very good job responding. You should have expanded on the idea of slavery a little more it would have made your case stronger.

- The neg gave good Examples that backed up ~~up~~ his two main points. Your argument for right to life was good but make sure if you say it is for us citizens only, when you use morality as a value make sure you back it up to its full definition, that was your weakest part of your speech.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

La Reina Sullivan

Max = 30

Palo Alto Gupta

Max = 30

Kathleen Sullivan

29

Madhu Gupta

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from MADHU GUPTA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: YES

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The winner had better justification for her value, criterion contentions.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Kalakuntla

Max = 30

Palo Alto Rao

Max = 30

Tej Kalakuntla

28

Sama Rao

26.5

The better debating was done by the Aff from MSJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

With various non-interacting arguments across the flow, weighing of issues would have been very useful. The aff clearly won the VC debate, while the neg failed to mention competing VC's until last speech. The aff should have made this more clear b/c it is an instant game over issue. The myth/truth refuted most rzn's that military tribunals are supposedly superior. Thus, I voted aff.

- please make full extensions
C, w, i → you only say to extend across the flow but these would have a greater effect if you linked impacts to VC to show how aff world > neg world
- myth/fact card was very effective easily discounted much of neg case in short time span
↳ would have been more useful had you directly pointed out each aspect of her case refuted
- aff missed a couple of game over issues that would have been easy wins: VC → she had no rebuttal in the VC debate... you could have de-linked her case from your VC

- face Judge rather than opponent during cross ex... you also place paper in front of your mouth
- please sign post →
ie- In response to opp C1 + Sub B ...
- no VC debate until last neg speech...
- where are your voters?
You need to spell out why you win. The arg are just left in the round with unclear impacts/interactions

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, BUT NOT TENTHS!!!

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland Loftis

Max = 30

Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti

Max = 30

Cameron Loftis

29

Dominick Mortarotti

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bishop O Dowd.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both people are very good speakers, and present their cases and point of views very well. However, Neg present the case and arguments better, which convinced me.